



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

SP

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/762,668	01/22/2004	David L. Patton	80521B/F-P	5162

7590 03/10/2005

Pamela R. Crocker
Patent Legal Staff
Eastman Kodak Company
343 State Street
Rochester, NY 14650-2201

EXAMINER

HENDERSON, MARK T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3722

DATE MAILED: 03/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/762,668

Applicant(s)

PATTON, DAVID L.

Examiner

Mark T Henderson

Art Unit

3722

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 February 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4-6 and 8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4-6, 8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit:

DETAILED ACTION

Faxing of Responses to Office Actions

In order to reduce pendency and avoid potential delays, TC 3700 is encouraging FAXing of responses to Office Actions directly into the Group at (703)872-9306. This practice may be used for filing papers which require a fee by applicants who authorize charges to a PTO deposit account. Please identify the examiner and art unit at the top of your cover sheet. Papers submitted via FAX into TC 3700 will be promptly forwarded to the examiner.

1. Claim 1 has been amended for further examination. Claim 3 and 7 have been canceled. Claim 8 has been added.
2. After further review and consideration of the allowable subject matter from the previous office action, the examiner has withdrawn the finality of that action and a non-final office action has been given below.

Art Unit:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 2, 4-6 and 8, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morelle et al (5,735,547) in view of Ottawa Citizen.

Morelle discloses in Fig. 1A-2C, a document (M, having some intrinsic value such as a stamps or sheet of stamps; as stated in Col. 2, lines 45-50) comprising a visible first indicia (20 as seen in Fig. 2B) identifying document, a second indicia (as seen in Fig. 2C, wherein the indicia is in the shape of a star) that cannot be scanned and is not visible under normal viewing conditions (As seen in Fig. 2A-2C, and in Col. 5, lines 55-68 and Col. 6, lines 20-33).

However, Morelle et al does not disclose a stamp comprising: first indicia identifying stamp as limited edition and one out of a predetermined amount; a third indicia for identifying a printer or location where stamp was printed, wherein the third indicia is not visible to the eye under normal viewing conditions, is not capable of being scanned.

Ottawa Citizen discloses in lines 2, 3 and 24-28, a limited edition postal stamp comprising indicia to show that the stamp or sheet of stamps is one out of a predetermined number (1,000).

Art Unit:

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Morelle et al's document to be in the form of a stamp comprising indicia as taught by Ottawa Citizen for the purpose of providing a limited edition postal stamp.

In regards to **Claim 1 and 8**, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to place any desirable indicia on the document substrate, since it would only depend on the intended use of the assembly and the desired information to be displayed. Further, it has been held that when the claimed printed matter is not functionally related to the substrate it will not distinguish the invention from the prior art in terms of patentability. The fact that the content of the printed matter placed on the document substrate may render the device unique by providing an individual with a specific type of article does not alter the functional relationship. Mere support by the substrate for the printed matter (indicia) is not the kind of functional relationship necessary for patentability. Therefore, it would have been obvious to place any indicia on the document, since applicant has not disclosed that only using stamp indicia is critical to the invention, and invention would function equally as well if it had any type of indicia on a substrate which needs to be authenticated such as art or a photograph and autograph display.

In regard to **Claims 1, 4 and 8**, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include as many types of indicia having the same characteristics as those of a preceding indicia (second indicia) as desired, since it has been held

Art Unit:

that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to place any number of indicia on the stamp substrate, since applicant has not disclosed the criticality of having a particular number, that such a modification would produce no new or unexpected results for patentability, and the invention would operate would operate equally as well with any number of indicia.

In regards to **Claims 1, 5 and 8**, wherein the second and third indicia is not capable of being scanned; and wherein the third indicia is used for identifying a printer or printing location, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. Therefore, the indicia (second) of the Morelle et al reference is capable used for printer identification or printing location.

In regards to **Claims 1, 6 and 8**, the method of making the second and third indicia by using an ink that can be seen when viewed under UV or infrared light does not structurally limit the claim. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior art was made by a different process (see MPEP 2113). Therefore, it would be obvious to make the indicia by using any desirable ink.

Art Unit:

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

In regards to **Claims 1, 6 and 8**, the method of making the second and third indicia by using an ink that can be seen when viewed under UV or infrared light does not structurally limit the claim. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior art was made by a different process (see MPEP 2113). Therefore, it would be obvious to make the indicia by using any desirable ink.

Art Unit:


Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark T. Henderson whose telephone number is (703)305-0189. The examiner can be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:30 AM to 3:45 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner supervisor, A. L. Wellington, can be reached on (703) 308-2159. The fax number for TC 3700 is (703)-872-9302. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC 3700 receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-1148.



MTH

March 6, 2005



**DERRIS H. BANKS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700**